## **EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**



DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

## RECEIVED

JUN 1 4 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMONICATIONS COMMUNICATIONS COMMONICATIONS COMMONICATION

Three North Second Street · Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Ms. Donna R. Searcy Page 2 June 9, 1993

A male prisoner was told by his wife last February that she was going to divorce him. He desperately needed counseling to help him handle this disintegration of his family. Since Blair County Prison has only one counselor for an average of 230 prisoners, individual sessions are rare. Because he had no one else to help him, he called his mother frequently. Realizing how depressed he was, she had long conversations trying to help him. Her bill that month was just over \$400.00.

Incarceration is nearly always destructive of family life. The telephone is often the only thread of communication that holds the family together, so that, upon release, the offender has some family to return to. Using the desperate need of families to communicate as a means of profit for others (especially the companies that sell prison telephone systems and the prison systems to which they pay "rebates") should not be allowed by the Federal Communications Commission. We feel that prisoners and their families have a right to use the long distance telephone company of their choice — one that does not have defective service and does not charge exorbitant rates.

Our local prison, we believe, is typical of other county prisons in this country. Conditions are overcrowded, there are hardly any rehabilitation or learning programs, mental health problems and suicide attempts are frequent. Sometimes telephone conversations are an inmate's only source of hope. For these reasons we support wholeheartedly the comments filed by C.U.R.E. and ask you to keep prison telephone service as part of Billed Party Preference.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Aline D. Wolf

Co-covneor

Blair County Chapter

Pennsylvania Prison Society